



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/764,989	01/26/2004	Sigrid Buhler	14.1-11	6777
61638	7590	06/06/2006	EXAMINER	
SIGMA-ALDRICH CO. 3050 SPRUCE STREET ST. LOUIS, MO 63013			ISSAC, ROY P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1623	
DATE MAILED: 06/06/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/764,989	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BUHLER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Roy P. Issac	<b>Art Unit</b> 1623	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

This application claims priority to U.S. provisional application no. 60/449,070 filed on February 21, 2003.

#### ***Election/Restrictions***

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-17 in part, drawn to a compound of formula (1) wherein Z is a leaving group, classified in class 558, subclass 480.
- II. Claims 1-17 in part, drawn to a compound of formula (1) wherein Z is an O-atom of a hydroxyl group or a N-atom of an amine group, respectively, of a compound comprising the photolabile protective group, classified in class 558, subclass 480.
- III. Claims 1-17 in part, drawn to a compound of formula (1) wherein Z is a deoxyribonucleoside or a ribonucleoside, classified in class 536, subclass 22.1.
- IV. Claims 18-19, drawn to a method of preparation of derivatized nucleosides, classified in class 536, subclass 22.1.
- V. Claims 20-21, drawn to a method of preparation of nucleosides, classified in class 536, subclass 22.1.
- VI. Claims 22-25, drawn to a light controlled method of preparation of oligonucleotides, classified in class 532, subclass 25.3.

Art Unit: 1623

- VII. Claim 26, drawn to a compound of formula (4), classified in class 558, subclass 480.
- VIII. Claims 27-28, drawn to a method of derivatizing an amine, classified in class 558, subclass 480.
- IX. Claim 29, drawn to a method of removing a photolabile protective group, classified in class 558, subclass 480.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I-III, and VII are independent and distinct from each other. Inventions I-III and VII are drawn to compounds which have divergent moieties in the Z position. Compounds of group I contains a leaving group in the Z position while group contains a photolabile protective group. Group III contains a ribonucleoside or a deoxy-ribonucleoside in position Z while compounds of group VII entirely lacks position Z.

Each of the groups in I-III and VII is directed to or involves the use of compounds which have Z groups that are recognized in the art as being distinct from one another because of their diverse chemical structure, their different chemical properties, modes of action, different effects, and reactive conditions. Additionally, the level of skill in the art is not such that the invention would be obvious over the other, i.e., they are patentable over each other. Chemical structures which are similar are presumed to function similarly, while chemical structures which are not similar are not presumed

Art Unit: 1623

function similarly. The presumption even for similar chemical structures though is not irrefutable, but may be overcome by scientific reasoning or evidence showing that the structure of the prior art would not have been expected to function as the structure of the claimed invention. Note that in accordance with the holding of Application of Papesch, 50CCPA 1084, 315 F.2d 381, 137 USPQ 43 (CCPA 1963), and In Re Lulu 223 USPQ 1257 (Fed. Cir. 1984), chemical structures are patentably distinct where structures are either not structurally similar, or the prior art fails to suggest a function of a claimed compound would have been expected from a similar structure. The moieties of the various groups in the Z position would not be expected to have similar functions, as such, the groups I-III and VII are seen to be independent and distinct from each other.

Inventions III and IV-V are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, materially different processes can be used to make the derivatized ribonucleoside or deoxyribonucleoside. For example, the derivatized compounds can be made by either of the process in invention IV or V.

Inventions IV and V are directed to related processes for derivatizing nucleosides. The related inventions are distinct if the inventions as claimed do not

Art Unit: 1623

overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants; and the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions are mutually exclusive because invention IV involves the activation of nucleoside by the use of phosgene while invention V involves the activation of the additive molecule of general structure (4) by the use of phosgene.

Inventions VI, VIII and IX are independent and distinct because they have materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. Invention VI involves the light-controlled synthesis of oligonucleotides while invention VII involves a process for derivatizing an amine without the use of light while invention IX involves a process for the removal of a protecting group. Due to their different modes of operation, function and effect they are independent and distinct from each other.

Inventions I-V and VII are independent and distinct from groups VI, VIII and IX, because they have materially different design mode of operation. Groups VI, VIII and IX involve general methods for light controlled synthesis of oligonucleotides, derivatization of amine and the removal of a protecting group while inventions I-III and VII are directed to organic compounds with the general formula (1). They have different modes of operation and function and as such are independent and distinct.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. It would indeed impose an undue burden upon the examiner in charge of this application if the instant restriction requirement is not set forth.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims

Art Unit: 1623

and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.

Because the above set forth restriction/election requirement is complex, a telephone call to applicant's agent to request an oral election was not made. See MPEP § 812.01.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.



Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roy P. Issac whose telephone number is 571-272-2674. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shaojia Anna Jiang can be reached on 571-272-0627. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Roy P. Issac  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1623  
April 28, 2006

  
S. Anna Jiang, Ph.D.  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1623